

ACTIVE CASES
Analysis July 2003 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 97
(drops excluded)

Statewide Total July:

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$16,512.00
Total Number Error Cases:	19
Error Amount Total:	\$ 1,125.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	6.87%

FFY 2003 Error Rate YTD: 9.1%

****(19.6% of the total number of cases sampled were in error)****

Milwaukee County July:

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$5923.00
Tot Number of Error Cases:	12
Error Amount Total:	\$ 644.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	10.9%

FFY 2003 Error Rate: 12.1%

Rest of State- July:

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$ 10,589.00
Total Number of Error Cases:	7
Error Amount Total:	\$ 481.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	4.5%

FFY 2003 Error Rate: 6.7%

CHANGE REPORTING WAIVER (Phase 1)

A review of error cases that in the best-case scenario would not be considered errors under the new change reporting waiver shows the following results. The error rate for July would look like this:

- **Statewide Totals:**

Total Number Error Cases:	12
Error Amount Total:	\$681

Percentage of Dollars in Error: 4.1% (July)

- **Milwaukee County Totals:** (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases: 9
Error Amount Total: \$507
Percentage of Dollars in Error: 8.6% (July)

- **Rest of State Totals** (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases: 3
Error Amount Total: \$ 174
Percentage of Dollars in Error: 1.6% (July)

Statewide, of the 19 errors:

- **8** were agency preventable errors.
- **10** were client “failure to report” errors—seven of which would likely not be considered errors under new waiver . The rest of the client errors would still be included as they all were either failure to report correct circumstances at application or review, or failure of the worker to act on reported changes correctly.)
- **One** was an error that was classified as a CARES error—a seven month certification—as there was not enough evidence to prove it was a worker error, though those often are. [Under reduced reporting policy we will be able review certifications than run over 6 months like the other reduced reporting cases as long as they were notified of those 130% FPL reporting rules. In this particular case it wouldn't have been considered an error.]

Overview of the errors and where they occurred:

- The monthly state rate has continued to decline since February.
- **APES:** Of the 8 APES, 5 were in Milwaukee, and 3 in balance of state.
Type of APES (primary error-- some had multiple reasons):
 - **6**-Child Support Budgeting Errors at application or review.
 - **1**-Failure to act on new hire matches
 - **1**-Issuance to person living in an ineligible private for-profit living setting
 -
- **Client non-reporting (10):**
- Types of non-reporting errors:
 - **2**- Failure to report correct household composition
 - **1**- Failure to report new job
 - **1**. Failure to report a job at FS application

- 1-Failure to report receipt from a new source of Child Support
- 1- Failure to report wage rate increase
- 1 -Failure to report Unemployment Comp ended
- 1- Failure to report a move and new shelter costs.
- 1 –Failure to report Participation in Tribal Food Distribution Program (renders them ineligible for FS for that month)
- Failure to report receipt of Social Security for two children

Trends or Possible Recommendations?

- Positive downward trends.
- Some alarming new statistics on worker errors for **Child Support calculations**: six of the eight APES were CS errors. Most were not averaging the correct months, or using partial current month in the average. QC was often unable to see how the average was determined, or find any documentation to justify using an alternative to the prior 3-month norm. A couple errors were failure to re-calculate a new average at re-certification. Two were Milwaukee errors, four in balance of state. Possibly a strongly-worded Payment Accuracy Tip is in order as a quick fix.
- Since this is the second consecutive month that there was an error due to receipt of FS and Tribal Commodities, is there some way this can be prevented?

•

“Biggest Contributors: The two cases that caused the largest dollar errors for June 2003 (including client errors):

- **(1) (Milwaukee County), \$137 Client Error:** Client did not report at application that she was living with her mother, and since she is under 22, she was required to be in the same FS group with her mother. The FS group with the mother exceeded the program income limits. Remedy: emphasize asking about everyone in the home, not just those for whom assistance is requested. Also scrutinize shelter verifications—they are often signed by a person with the same name—then ask applicant if they live in the same house as the “landlord” or “owner” who signs it.
- **(2) (Chippewa County), \$88 Client Error:** Client did not report commencement of child support payments of \$100 biweekly. (Under reduced reporting policy this would not have put the case over the 130% of FPL, and in most cases child support income alone would not make them ineligible. CS income along with other existing income sources could, however).
- **Biggest APE error cases:**
While APE errors were not among the two largest dollar errors this month, there were several in the \$60 to \$70 to \$80 range, and they definitely contributed to the error rate. As mentioned they mostly were faulty CS budgeting at certification and re-certification—an issue which apparently needs attention.